

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
67 KRYSTAL M. EVANESKI,)
8 v.) No. CV-11-0142-CI
9 MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,) ORDER GRANTING STIPULATED
Commissioner of Social) MOTION FOR REMAND PURSUANT
Security,) TO SENTENCE SIX OF 42 U.S.C.
10) § 405(g)
11 Defendant.)
1213 BEFORE THE COURT is the parties' stipulated Motion for Sentence
14 Six Remand of the above-captioned matter to the Commissioner for
15 additional administrative proceedings. (ECF No. 13.) The parties
16 have consented to proceed before a magistrate judge. (ECF No. 7.)17 Pursuant to sentence six of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) ("sentence six"),
18 the court may remand the case to the Commissioner for good cause
19 shown before the Commissioner files an answer. See *Melkonyan v.*
20 *Sullivan*, 501 U.S. 89, 98, 101 n.2 (1991). Here, the Commissioner
21 filed an answer on June 20, 2011; however, the parties stipulate
22 that good cause exists for a sentence six remand in that neither the
23 administrative law judge (ALJ) nor the Appeals Council considered,
24 or included in the record, medical records submitted by Plaintiff in
25 December 2008, April 2010, and June 2010. (ECF No. 13.)26 Sentence six further requires the Commissioner to return to the
27 district court to "file with the court any such additional or
28

1 modified findings of fact and decision, and a transcript of the
2 additional record and testimony upon which his action in modifying
3 or affirming was based." *Id.* at 98 (quoting sentence six).
4 Accordingly,

5 **IT IS ORDERED:**

6 1. The parties' stipulated Motion for Sentence Six Remand
7 (**ECF No. 13**) is **GRANTED**.

8 2. On remand, the ALJ shall (a) update the treatment evidence
9 regarding Plaintiff's medical conditions, including the evidence
10 submitted in December 2008, April 2010, and June 2010; (b) expressly
11 evaluate the treating and examining medical source opinions
12 submitted in December 2008, April 2010, and June 12010; (c) further
13 consider Plaintiff's residual functional capacity on the updated
14 record, citing specific evidence in support of the assessed
15 limitations; (d) further consider whether Plaintiff has past
16 relevant work she could perform with the limitations established by
17 the evidence; and (e) as appropriate, secure supplemental evidence
18 from a vocational expert to clarify the effect of the assessed
19 limitations on Plaintiff's occupational base.

20 3. The court shall maintain jurisdiction of this action.

21 4. The District Court Executive is directed to enter this
22 Order and forward copies to counsel.

23 DATED March 1, 2012.

24

25

S/ CYNTHIA IMBROGNO
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
27